

Applicants : Steven L. Ringler et al.  
Appln. No. : 10/099,886  
Page : 6

### REMARKS

In the present Office Action, claims 1 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,423,942 (hereinafter Liao); claims 7, 10, 16, 25 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liao in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,721,121 (hereinafter Adams); claims 11, 12, 13 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Liao in view of Adams and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,354,967 (hereinafter Barzilai); and claims 2-6, 8, 9, 14, 17-22 and 24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of any base claim and any intervening claim. Applicants have canceled dependent claim 25 and incorporated the subject matter of claim 25 in independent claim 16. Applicants wish to express their appreciation to the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter. However, for the reasons that are further set forth below, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-24 and 26 are allowable over the applied cited art of record.

Applicants have included herewith a request for a three-month extension of time to respond to the present Office Action, including authorization to charge the appropriate fee to Deposit Account No. 16-2463.

With respect to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Liao, Applicants respectfully submit that contrary to the assertion of the Office Action, Liao does not teach a shroud having a hair inlet aperture. More specifically, item 23 of Liao is a display window that is aligned within a lamp-type heat source member to allow a user to directly inspect the state of a lamp-type heat source member and, thus, cannot function as a hair inlet aperture. Thus, the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Liao is in error and should be withdrawn. Similarly, with respect to independent claim 16, neither Liao nor Adams, or the combination thereof, teach or suggest a shroud that includes a hair inlet aperture. For at least this reason, independent claim 16, as

Applicants : Steven L. Ringler et al.  
Appln. No. : 10/099,886  
Page : 7

amended, is also allowable. Additionally, dependent claims 2-15, 17-24 and 26 depend upon allowable claims and are also allowable for at least this reason.

Applicants respectfully submit that this reply is fully responsive to the above-referenced Office Action and that no new matter has been added with the amendments to the claims.

#### CONCLUSION


For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submits that claims 1-24 and 26 are now allowable. If the Examiner has any questions or comments with respect to this reply, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (616) 949-9610.

Respectfully submitted,

STEVEN L. RINGLER ET AL.

By: PRICE, HENEVELD, COOPER,  
DEWITT & LITTON, LLP

09-09-04  
Date

  
Michael R. Long  
Registration No. 42 808  
695 Kenmoor SE  
P.O. Box 2567  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49501-2567  
616/949-9610

MRL/saw